DEPARTMENT • OF • WATER • RESOURCES
CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN
UPDATE 2005

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP COMMENTS
FRESNO, CA

Date:	***June 30, 2005*** 1:00 – 5:00 pm	*Location:*	***Fresno*** State of California Building 2550 Mariposa Mall, Room 1036
Meeting Purpose and Goals:	To hear and record public comment on the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005		
All meeting materials, including the PowerPoint presentation, are available at the California Water Plan website at: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm			

Presenters:
Scott Cantrell, Advisory Committee member, CA Department of Fish and Game
Kamyar Guivetchi, Manager, Statewide Water Planning, CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)
Paula Landis, District Chief, San Joaquin District, DWR
Julia Lee, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento
John Mills, Advisory Committee member, Regional Council of Rural Counties

Introduction: Format and Purpose

Julia Lee, meeting facilitator, introduced the presenters and DWR staff and welcomed everyone to the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Public Input Workshop in Fresno. She thanked the State of California for providing the meeting facility. The purpose of the meeting was for the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive public input and to share ideas for the Public Review Draft of the CA Water Plan.

The workshop format was interactive. Participants sat in table groups. The meeting consisted of 3 presentations by Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR), each followed by group discussion at each table. Advisory Committee members Scott Cantrell and John Mills spoke on behalf of the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Advisory Committee, and DWR San Joaquin District Paula Landis gave a presentation on the San Joaquin River Regional Report, which is located in Volume 3 of the CA Water Plan. Each table station had a DWR staff person who helped record the group discussion on a flipchart. Each table group chose a reporter among themselves who would summarize the group discussion to the entire audience on behalf of the group. Near the end of the meeting, time was reserved for a traditional spoken comment period where individuals could orally presented prepared statements. For detailed description of the format, see the "Working in Groups" handout.

Part 1 – Agenda Items A and B
A) Background & Overview / B) Comments from the Advisory Committee

This *Water Plan Update* is different than previous updates. It was prepared using a new process. There are many new features in the Water Plan. It will be continually updated as new information becomes available, and it presents a strategic plan and framework for action developed with substantial

stakeholder input. Kamyar Guivetchi spoke on the content and strategic planning process used in the Water Plan. Advisory Committee members Scott Cantrell and John Mills explained the *Advisory Committee View*, a 4-page handout prepared by the Advisory Committee that summarizes the areas of agreement and points of disagreement among the 65-member Advisory Committee over the last four and a half years, and uncertainties remaining in the Water Plan.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables:

Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
Individual Comment forms: + More people worked on this plan than in previous plans. + Easier to plan if you know what you are doing. + Like data management and analysis. + Liked scientific understanding.	**No Table 1** **Table 2:** Δ No comment. **Table3:** Δ Emphasize more storage expansion at the beginning. Δ Future scenarios were just included to appease environmentalists – environmental obstruction. Δ Need more discussion on rights of water users. Δ Need more discussion of future population and water supply. Δ More focus on improving the amount of water, as opposed call it "increase supply." **Individual Comment forms:** Δ Advisory Committee much too large. Δ Never – never had agreement on storage between enviros and all other stakeholders. Δ The conduct of meetings could vastly improve from "how do we feel today" to "let's role up our sleeves and get to work" Δ Need more discussion on the effects of projects – different groups do thing that benefit themselves without thinking about impacts on others. Δ The Water Plan needs to add more federal rules and statutes, including the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation operations of reservoirs (Napa Agreement).	**No Table 1** **Table 2:** • How are the CVPIA and federal government tied to the Water Plan? • Budget shortfalls impact communities; how does that fit into the Water Plan? • Too much federal control of water used in the state. • Differences in supply between CVP and SWP to rowers and users. **Table 3:** • Regulatory issues are not addressed. • Feel that the Water Plan should just be a plan to manage storage. • Why is storage not mentioned much in the Water Plan? **Individual Comment forms:** • How will funding be done? • Increased population will increase water demand. • Going to be building new dam at Tule River (Success Dam) but no other supplies to be developed – too much emphasis on conservation. • How would federal laws such as the Endangered Species Act and CVPIA be integrated into regional plans? • How does the Water Plan work with federal water policy?

	Δ Need to address how CVPIA affects local groups while still staying within the law. There is conflict among groups. Δ Say that urban supplies are coming from agricultural supplies. Δ Say that more storage = more water for the environment.	

Part 2 – Agenda Items C and D
C) California Water Today & Water Balance / D) Regional Reports

It is important for a strategic plan to have a clear description of current conditions and situations. Chapter 3 of Volume 1: Strategic Plan is called "California Water Today." As the largest chapter in Volume 1 (about 120 pages), it is intended to provide education and reference information. It gives general findings from both statewide and regional perspectives as well as the perspectives of different water use sectors (agriculture, urban, and environment). Volume 3 of the Water Plan has more detailed information on each of the 10 hydrologic regions (plus additional reports for Statewide, Mountain Counties, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta), covering conditions, challenges, accomplishments, and future opportunities of the Region presented, as well as quantified water balances for supply and use. Kamyar Guivetchi presented the California Water today and statewide water balances, and San Joaquin District Chief Paula Landis summarized the Volume 3 regional reports for the San Joaquin River hydrologic region.

Below is a summary of the comments made by individuals at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking about the description of California Water Today and the Regional Reports, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
Individual Comment forms: + Liked the bar graph on page 15 of the *Highlights* document. + Liked how the Water Plan addresses policy impacts of recent years to the water supply today.	**Table 2:** Δ Provide money to study resource planning in government land use. Δ Need future year data for planning. **Table 3:** Δ Increase discussion of litigation/ court cases Δ Define restoration when used with the ecosystem. Δ Explain in detail the amounts of water needed for ecosystem restoration (e.g. San Joaquin River). Δ Need more discussion of recent policy impacts on agriculture (CVPIA, CALFED, etc.).	**Table 2:** • Concern that budget shortfalls impact communities. • There may not be finds to do some integrated resources planning. **Table 3:** • Is agriculture credited with groundwater recharge as part of the total reuse in the San Joaquin River? • Why was 2001 chosen as a dry year? Not as dry as the early 1990's. • What have been the impacts on beneficiaries?

	Δ Put more discussion on policy impacts. Δ Discuss water storage – what, how, and why. Δ Discuss water rights.	**Individual Comment forms:** • Need more protection for people with inelastic water demands. • Discuss policy impacts on the different sectors (agriculture, urban, environment). • Growth plans for municipalities don't address water supply, or where the water for housing tracts are coming from. • The State is urging local water management plans so local regional areas talk. • Times are tough for local governments. • There needs to be a balance; it's not fair that one farmer only gets 25% while the farmer down the streets gets all he wants. • Water rights are hard to change. People with too much water aren't to volunteer to give up their supply. • No more water transfers are going on. • It is hard to get federal funding for projects in California.

Part 3 – Agenda Items E and F
E) Preparing for the Future (Scenarios) / F) Diversifying Responses (Strategies)

This *Water Plan Update 2005* recognizes that many things may alter water use and supplies between now and 2030. For that reason, the *Update* contains a description of three plausible yet different future scenarios. Uncertainty about future course of events creates a need for multiple options to address opportunities and challenges. Further, the Plan recognizes that one size does not fit all regions of the state. Each region will have specific requirements or needs that may not apply across the entire state. Implementing multiple options (diverse management strategies) allows water planners and managers to adapt to a variety of circumstances. Volume 2 (Resource Management Strategies) has narrative descriptions for 25 different management strategies available to help them reduce water demand, improve operational efficiency and transfers, increase water supply, improve water quality, and practice resource stewardship.

Below is a summary of the comments made by individuals at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking from the perspective of 2030 are there things about this approach to plan for the future you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
Table 2: + Liked bar graph on page 15 of the *Highlights* document. **Table3:** + Liked scenario development. + Agree with the Agricultural Water Use Efficiency potential supply estimates (very small).	**Table 2:** Δ Discuss world market (i.e., almond crops) mostly shipped to Asia. Δ More explanation needed for reduction in agriculture for Tulare Lake Region by 2030. Δ Emphasize increased storage capacity. Δ "Bathtub" concept is not clear enough. **Individual Comment forms:** Δ Acknowledge agricultural exports and world markets. Δ Acknowledge oversubscribing of water supplies. Δ Water rights and contracts are not considered. Δ Scenarios seem to be too much driven by agricultural water use.	**Table 2:** • Concerned about pumping Delta water to Southern CA. • Concerned about urban growth. • Concerned about recent legislation on water. **Table 3:** • How can there be that much reduction in agricultural demand (in Tulare Lake region)? • Do the Trinity River unmet environmental flow demands include recent court decisions (Table 4-4). • What is the basis for the 268 taf of unmet need on the San Joaquin River (Table 4-4)? • Are economic incentives discussed? • What is the basis for conveyance savings? • Surface Storage is a noncompeting strategy. • Conjunctive use can move water out of the region, but not in the quantity suggested by the Water Plan. • Appears that Water Plan is suggesting a top-down management approach; control not by locals but by regional entities. **Individual Comment forms:** • Do not understand projected figures of less water use in Tulare Lake region in 2030. • What were the Scenario assumptions? • What were assumptions of the capacity of the conveyance system?

Part 4 Additional Public Comments

- There is no such thing as an "average" year. It is different from region to region. This Bulletin reflects actual years vs. past bulletins where a normalized year was used.
- Is the Pacific Institute Report similar to DWR's Water Plan?
- Lifestyles may have to change. If we need more supply, then golf courses may have to go, but DWR won't make recommendations to alter lifestyles. Explain the huge demand reductions in Tulare Lake for 2030 estimates.
- Have a slideshow presentation on cable access television.
- Have separate volumes for the general public vs. policy wonks
- Have break(s) between workshop breakout sessions
- Put workshop announcement in the newspapers
- Have less "busy" Regional Report diagrams
- Conduct Water Plan analysis by region in lieu of a statewide analysis
- Public participants seem to want to ask specific questions – have ample Q & A time set aside

Part 5 – Formal Public Comments (in order of presentation):

Members of the public were welcome to present statements in the formal style of a traditional public hearing. No members of the public registered to speak.

Part 6 – Closing

Kamyar thanked the audience for participating in the public comment workshop and for their comments. He reminded everyone that the public review period will last through July 22, to allow for 60 days since the release of the printed Public Review Draft document.

The final comment deadline is July 22.

Attendance:

Public:

Sally Abapa, Office of Senator Dianne Feinstein
Darren L. Belk, Cobb Ranch
Robert Brewer, SJRA
Scott Cantrell, CA Department of Fish and Game, CA Water Plan Advisory Committee
Lyn Garver, Kings River Conservation District
L. Geis, Public
Mark Gilkey, Tulare Lake Basin
Brent Graham, Tulare Lke Basin Water Storage District
Michael Hagman, Friant Water Authority
Cheryl Lehn, Office of Congress Jim Costa
John S. Mills, Regional Council of Rural Counties, CA Water Plan Advisory Committee
Steve Ottemoeller, URS
Mark Rhodes, Westlands Water District

Alfreda Sebasto, VWA
Theresa Sebasto, California Water Institute
Kathy Webb, League of Women Voters of CA
David Young, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

Staff:

Paul Dabbs
Kamyar Guivetchi
Julia Lee
Mike McGinnis
Chris Montoya
Neil Rambo
Dave Scruggs
Gholam Shakouri
David Sumi
Iris Yamagata